

## WASHINGTON STATE BIODIVERSITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

*DATE: October 6-7, 2009  
TIME: 9:00 a.m.*

*PLACE: Chelan County Fire District 3  
Leavenworth, Washington*

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Josh Weiss, Chair  
Dave Roseleip, Vice Chair  
Leonard Bauer  
Dave Brittell  
Rob Fimbel  
Mitch Friedman  
John Garner  
Peter Heide  
Ron Juris  
Tom Laurie  
John Marzluff  
Ikuno Masterson  
Mike Mosman  
Lynda Ransley  
Ron Shultz  
Clay Sprague  
Kate Stenberg  
Jamie Tolfree  
Megan White

Washington State Association of Counties  
Washington Agriculture & Forestry Education Foundation  
Washington Department of Commerce  
Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife  
State Parks  
Conservation Northwest  
Tacoma Nature Center  
Washington Forest Protection Association  
Diamond J Farms, Inc  
Department of Ecology  
University of Washington  
American Planning Association-Washington Chapter  
Port Blakely Tree Farms  
Puget Sound Partnership  
Washington State Conservation Commission  
Department of Natural Resources  
Scientist  
Skamania County  
Washington State Department of Transportation

### PRESENTERS and GUESTS:

Maggie Coon  
Kaleen Cottingham  
Rachael Langen  
Steve McLellan  
Steven Walters  
Nancy Warner  
Cheryl Dawes  
John Thoren  
John Gamon  
Rufus Woods  
Mary Webb  
Bill Robinson

Past Council Chair  
Director, Recreation and Conservation Office  
Deputy Director, Recreation and Conservation Office  
Recreation and Conservation Office  
University of Washington  
Initiative for Rural Innovation and Stewardship  
Initiative for Rural Innovation and Stewardship  
Initiative for Rural Innovation and Stewardship  
Washington Natural Heritage Program  
Wenatchee World  
Guest  
Robinson Research

### STAFF and CONTRACTORS:

Paul Dziedzic  
Lynn Helbrecht  
Sarah Gage  
Rachel LeBaron Anderson

Facilitator  
Staff  
Staff  
Staff

### ACTIONS TAKEN

Item	Action	Reference
Meeting minutes	Approved	Page 2
Council Funding decisions	Approved	Page 11

## **SUMMARY OF MEETING ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

- June 3, 2009 meeting minutes approved.
- Council response to the Governor's Natural Resource Reform Initiative discussed and direction provided for a final comment letter.
- The Council learned about progress on developing the Biodiversity Scorecard and provided feedback.
- Rufus Woods, publisher of the Wenatchee World, spoke at the Council's evening session.
- Nancy Warner and other members of the Initiative for Rural Innovation and Stewardship presented findings and recommendations from their Council-funded project.
- Council approved project funding of \$10,000 for additional work on the Biodiversity Scorecard (October–December 2009).
- Council approved project funding of \$10,000 to the Land Use and Local Government working group to create a partnership on biodiversity and land use planning that will provide a focal point for existing efforts; guide collection and dissemination/delivery of resources; and act a springboard for addressing further needs (December 2010–December 2011).
- Bill Robinson, of Robinson Research, Spokane, and contractor to the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group (a recipient of Council funds) presented results from stakeholder interviews and focus groups about wildlife habitat connectivity.

## **OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS OCTOBER 6, 2009:**

Josh Weiss, Chair, opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. Josh thanked everyone for attending and reviewed how much the Council has accomplished since its first retreat in 2005.

Josh introduced Paul Dziedzic, who will help facilitate the meeting. Ikuno commented she appreciated having the opportunity to make funding decisions on the second day because it allows for broader Council discussion.

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS ITEMS:**

Josh announced that Chris Davis of The Nature Conservancy has been nominated to fill Maggie Coon's vacancy on the Council; we are waiting for an official appointment from the governor's office.

Lynn Helbrecht reviewed the handouts and announced that we will use a Doodle poll to pick meeting dates for next year. She reviewed the Council's biennial budget; changes include a 2% budget cut and money donated by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

### ***Approval of Minutes***

Josh Weiss called for a **MOTION** to approve the June 3, 2009 meeting minutes. Dave Brittell **MOVED** approval of the minutes. Ron Juris **SECONDED**. The Council **APPROVED** the minutes as presented.

**PUBLIC COMMENT (agenda only):** None

## **GOVERNOR'S NATURAL RESOURCE REFORM INITIATIVE and BUDGET:**

Kaleen Cottingham, Director of the Washington Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) shared her thoughts on the comment process underway for the Natural Resource Reform Initiative, discussed options for extension of the Biodiversity Council, and what to expect in the supplemental budget.

The Council budget has taken a 2% cut; Office of Financial Management (OFM) is now considering a 5% cut. Kaleen said the maximum impact of 5% to the Biodiversity Council would be around \$6,000. The revenue forecast shows an additional \$1.2 billion drop statewide. There will be no further federal stimulus money.

Kaleen referred to the Council's interest in extending beyond June 2010 (the current sunset date in Executive Order 08-02). She recommended that the comments the Council submits during the Natural Resource Reform process need to be strategic and show the importance of the Council's role in the state. This will assist the effort to develop a new executive order extending the Council's term.

The Natural Resource Reform Report lists 26 ideas and public comment is underway. Steve McLellan reviewed the background of the Natural Resource Reform Initiative and how they arrived at the current report. He reviewed the ideas in the report and how they affect the Council. Kaleen stressed that Council comments need to be turned in early to allow for more cabinet review.

Josh clarified that the Council's draft letter is based on Council comments from the June. The executive committee referred to the Council's guiding principles and the leadership report. Josh showed a PowerPoint that listed the ideas in the Natural Resource Reform Report next to a statement summarizing the Council's response.

#### Council Discussion:

- Council members appreciated the letter's positive tone, but wanted it to speak more strongly.
- The Council's distinctive public/private partnership model should be stressed. The Council models a new collaborative way of doing business, with agencies working more closely with stakeholders.
- Ikuno cautioned that the letter should not overemphasize the Council's self-preservation but should focus more on integrated approaches to protect the state's biodiversity.
- Council members were concerned because studies have shown that merging agencies costs more and causes more problems. While a collaborative portal of information would be a positive development, not all natural resource agency functions need to be in one place.
- John Marzluff wanted the Council to add support of Idea 1-6, Realigning agency boundaries, and to ensure that those boundaries are based on ecological considerations.
- Dave Brittell suggested that the Council should also support Idea 3-2, GIS consolidation, given its Conservation Opportunity Framework maps.
- Mike Mosman would like the Council to support Idea 3-6, Outcome Based Environmental Management because of the link to incentive programs as a way to get to desired outcomes.
- John Garner felt the Council should also support Idea 3-1 related to the Growth Management Act (GMA—this elicited concern from others because opening the Act for review may be a fractious, controversial process. Most Council members agreed that if a review of GMA does take place, then how it affects biodiversity should be considered.
- Opinions varied about commenting on realigning agency regional boundaries. Several Council members expressed that the state should use ecoregional boundaries; others suggested that it was most important that the boundaries not be too complicated.
- Council members agreed with the addition of two ideas proposed in the draft letter: 1) establish a function within state agencies to lead and promote development of ecosystem markets and 2) collaborate and share resources related to environmental education. Some felt that these ideas could be more clearly described.
- Council members agreed that an emphasis on landowner incentives was important.

Lynn agreed to work with a few Council members to reconstruct the letter and to review planned changes with the Council before the end of the meeting. The final draft letter will go out to the Council for comment.

BREAK

#### **WORKGROUPS INTRODUCE FUNDING PROPOSALS:**

The Council has approximately \$40,000 available for projects. Each work group has prepared a project proposal. The Council will decide what to fund on the second day of the meeting.

#### Land Use and Local Government

Leonard Bauer presented this proposal, to create a partnership on biodiversity and land use planning that will provide a focal point for existing efforts; guide collection and dissemination/delivery of resources; and act as a springboard for addressing further needs. The goal is to assist local governments with the Conservation Opportunity Framework maps and other tools, based on lessons learned from the Initiative

for Rural Innovation and Stewardship and others. Such a partnership could potentially continue if the Council sunsets.

Leonard clarified that “creating a partnership” would mean convening an advisory group to facilitate getting tools and information to local groups in a format they can use. Some money would go to website redesign, and some to creating the tools. The working group was mindful that the Council might not continue; such a partnership and toolbox could continue on an ongoing basis.

#### Incentives and Markets

Ron Shultz reviewed this group’s proposal to create a detailed operational framework for a conservation opportunities clearinghouse for private landowners. The project would research other clearinghouse models, talk to stakeholders to see how this would be most useful, and possibly host a stakeholder workshop to test assumptions and gather feedback.

Washington State Conservation Commission has looked at a clearinghouse model, but only from the perspective of farmland preservation. The \$10,000 would only help figure out what is needed, not what would launch or maintain it. Peter Heide noted that in the Chesapeake Bay region, you can click on a map and get a list of things you can do on your property. Josh commented that this is an important next step in moving biodiversity forward even if we are not the group to implement it.

#### Education and Outreach

Ikuno Masterson introduced this proposal by reminding the Council of Senator Ken Jacobsen’s visit to the 2008 retreat and the discussion on “eco-depression.” This project would increase the spread of good news and recognition of biodiversity stewardship efforts through two parts, first by highlighting existing award-winning stewardship and second by proposing additional recognition programs as needed. This would widen the circle of recognition, build partnerships with award winners, and heighten awareness of how stewardship efforts conserve biodiversity.

This proposal incorporates aspects of a project originally recommended by the Incentives and Markets Workgroup.

#### Science and Information

Rob Fimbel introduced the proposed extension of the scorecard project to more fully develop metrics and build a framework for citizen science. The first year of the project, funded by \$84,000 from the Council, will provide the framework for the biodiversity indicators, as well as preliminary measures and a draft approach for reporting on the status of biodiversity in Washington State. The proposed two-month extension of funds will allow work on the contract to continue through to December 31, 2009.

The goal for the funding extension is to complete a set of deliverables that could be only partially completed by the end of October; these deliverables are also listed in further detail below. The extension money would keep Steven Walters on the project, with funding for a graduate student to work on the metrics. A pre-proposal for a grant from University of Washington for an additional year of funding has been submitted.

Council members asked for clarification about the \$10,000 and \$16,000 amounts. \$10,000 will pay for Steven’s time and provide a usable product. \$16,000 will add graduate student research hours to provide more metrics information and some citizen science aspects. If the project is funded at \$16,000, the budget for other projects will need to be adjusted.

#### **WORKING LUNCH**

Josh Weiss thanked Maggie Coon, past chair, for all of her work on the Council and presented her with a memory book that included comments from current and past members of the Council and partners. Maggie commented that “Over and over we have shown that biodiversity is relevant and important. The fact that so many are showing up for the meetings really says it all.”

#### **BIODIVERSITY OF THE EAST CASCADES**

Sarah Gage gave a presentation tying the Conservation Opportunity Framework maps to a few special aspects of the biodiversity in the local East Cascades ecoregion.

### **BIODIVERSITY SCORECARD WORKSHOP**

Steven Walters presented the major components of the scorecard, sample data, and examples of how the data can be interpreted. He overviewed the scorecard's framework: four indicator categories (elements of biodiversity, relevant ecological processes, human/socioeconomic processes, ecosystem services); thirty indicators; one or more metrics for each indicator. This framework will be used for eight ecological systems.

Steven showed how the metrics translated into numbers and explained what might make metrics differ in different ecological areas. The current metrics will receive further stakeholder review.

As a test of the scorecard Steven aggregated a biodiversity index for mesic forests in western Washington, arriving at a baseline score of 0.71. While difficult to compare this with conditions at statehood, it is a number that will become more meaningful as it is measured over time. As with the Dow Jones Index, changes in the numbers should alert you to changes in the current health of the state's biodiversity.

#### Scorecard exercise

The Council broke into groups. Each group attempted to place the indicators within the indicator categories to see how the elements work together.

#### Council Discussion

Paul Dziedzic asked the groups to discuss what confused them.

- All groups reported that the difference between human/socioeconomic processes and ecosystem services was not clear.
- Most groups reported that the indicator definitions were often unclear; they needed to look at metrics to understand what the indicators meant. For example, what did "resource provision" mean? They needed more information than just the titles.
- Discussion clarified that there is some natural overlap between human/socioeconomic processes and ecosystem services.

Steven noted that they have been defining human/socioeconomic processes as "things that humans are doing that affect biodiversity positively or negatively" and ecosystem services as "what humans get from biodiversity." Some indicators go either way (e.g., extensive herbivory); some, such as disturbance, could be positive or negative.

Paul asked the group what take-aways it identified:

- Definitions need to accompany indicators
- The scorecard should illuminate the value of ecosystem services. Including the negative in ecosystem services makes the term confusing.
- The whole product needs to be in plain English, so that the benefits and negative impacts are be more obvious.

Steven Walters introduced possibilities for aggregation—combinations of the indicators that could serve as coarse filters for management decisions, target or prioritize activities, or otherwise "tell a story" about Washington's biodiversity. The intent is to have the indicators be as flexible as possible for the user.

He provided an example (or brain teaser) for mesic forest:

- If we think of biodiversity as just being the richness of species, the Diversity Score = 0.64.
- If we consider ecological balance, the Balance Score = 0.59.
- The Diversity and Balance scores together = the Resilience Score of 0.61.
- Human Engagement score of 0.70 and Resilience Score of 0.61 = Sustainability Score of 0.66.
- There are different ways of relating the indicators to each other for broader level assessments.

### Council Discussion

- Council members found the rollups more accessible than the original tables (Dave R., Megan, Leonard)
- Concern about the rollups giving false sense of precision and surety.
  - Important to remember that the point system is an index not a percentage (Kate, Ikuno).
  - What does 1.0 mean? (Tom)
  - Indicators seem to have an implied scale—what is that? (Mike)
- The score needs to communicate more to the public. Right now the numbers only mean something to scientists. Need graphical presentation for the public to understand where the level of danger to biodiversity stands. The overall goal is to help decision makers and this scorecard does not do that. (Ikuno)
- Concern that the scorecard is most meaningful when it shows trends, but it would be years before trend data are in place. (Ikuno, Mike, John Garner)
  - Council members suggested that we could look in the past and get a slight trend (Kate, Ron, Megan)
    - Some of the data we are using is not recent enough to allow for that.
    - There should be more data for some areas, like Puget Sound.
    - It is surprising how little year-to-year data there actually is (John Marzluff)

### BREAK

Steven explained what the project will deliver in December if the Council agrees to \$10,000 additional funding:

- External review, revise indicators and metrics as necessary, provide documentation
- Completed mesic forest; some measures for other systems (30-40%).
- Marine ecological system (including work with Puget Sound Partnership and Monitoring Forum).
- Refined aggregate indicators
- Database of data sources/metadata.

The extra \$6,000 would add citizen science and more progress on aggregates. The limiting factor is time, not data.

John Marzluff clarified that a filled-out scorecard was never possible in one year. Currently we have a framework and have gone a long way toward filling in some of the data. This was a two-year project with only one year of funding. The proposal to the University of Washington is for \$125,000; a second year will provide time to provide the rest of the data.

- Council members expressed strong interest in seeing at least one finished ecosystem from eastern Washington (Ikuno, Ron Shultz, Dave R.)
  - Current funding not sufficient to provide that.
  - Funding from NOAA requires that the scorecard include the marine ecological system.
- Scorecard will require a huge amount of work to prepare it for decision makers. Council will need to deliver it strategically. (Leonard, Megan, Josh)
- Council members expressed confidence in the scientific credibility of the scorecard product (Dave Brittell, Kate, Megan, Clay, Ikuno, Mitch, Ron Juris, Mike, John Garner, Jamie, Ron Shultz, Lynda Ransley)
  - Strong concern both that the level of detail would overwhelm the layperson and that the aggregate scores are difficult to explain.
  - Concern about usability.
  - Must be fully documented to maintain credibility and transparency
- Communicating the scorecard is important and has not been addressed yet. (Dave Brittell, Kate, Megan, Clay, Ikuno, Mitch, Ron Juris, Mike, Lynda)
- Peter Heide cautioned about communication getting ahead of the science. He's interested in the external review; wants to show it to his scientists.

- Tom Laurie suggested that how metrics are lumped is important. Do extraction uses (e.g., timber harvest, hunting) fit with human engagement with the ecosystem? Are they ranked the same way as land for conservation?
- Concern about amount of work yet to be done, deliverables in December, and what the different amounts (\$10,000 or \$16,000) would buy. (Megan, Dave R., Jamie)
- Concern about how the scorecard would be maintained over time (Lynda, Leonard)

John Marzluff clarified that if the University provides the grant funding, the Biodiversity Council will be a full partner—will still have full input. Both entities would benefit.

### **NORTH CENTRAL WASHINGTON EARLY ACTION PROJECT PART I**

Nancy Warner introduced Witnessing Change. This citizen science project provides photo-monitoring trails as a structured way for people to look at landscape change. The field trip will take everyone to visit one of these places.

### **FIELD TRIP (Photo Monitoring Trail at Barn Beach Reserve)**

### **EVENING SESSION (Dinner at Barn Beach Reserve, with Speaker Rufus Woods, Owner and Publisher of the Wenatchee World)**

### **OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS OCTOBER 7, 2009:**

Josh Weiss opened the meeting at 8:22 a.m. Paul Dziedzic reviewed the previous day's field trip and the agenda. Lynn reviewed Council discussion on the Natural Resource reform letter to the governor. Edits will be based on the discussion of agreed-upon changes only.

### **“WASHINGTON'S BIODIVERSITY” – PREVIEW OF COUNCIL'S NEW VIDEO**

In the interests of saving time, the Council video will be shown at the December meeting.

### **NORTH CENTRAL WASHINGTON EARLY ACTION PROJECT PART II**

Nancy Warner gave a PowerPoint presentation that reviewed the mission and core activities of the Initiative for Rural Innovation and Stewardship (IRIS). IRIS will finish its pilot project for the Council in December. Their recommendations include: establishing regional biodiversity councils, developing a regional website, and supporting a regional learning network.

In IRIS's work with local land use planners, they found that planners are extremely busy, have little information on biodiversity, and do not generally know why it's important. Working with the Conservation Opportunity Framework (COF) maps was difficult, but ultimately proved useful to the planners. Planners wanted access to the data behind the maps, especially the biodiversity significance data.

Future IRIS projects (still seeking funding for some):

- Develop North Central Washington GIS collaborative. Local capacity is important.
- Expand Witnessing Change Network and photo monitoring trails: [www.witnessingchange.org](http://www.witnessingchange.org)
- Convene Healthy Lands Roundtable to provide opportunities for learning and sharing information about biodiversity. This will include their “Success Summit” November 18.
- Oral history: [www.gatheringourvoice.org](http://www.gatheringourvoice.org)

John Thoren emphasized that the initial meetings with planners were a little uncomfortable; it was important to build trust. By April people were becoming more engaged and were enjoying the process. It was essential to have GIS capacity to provide access to the underlying data. Adding the zoning layers to the model helped the product become their product, which was very important.

### **Council discussion, Q & A**

- What are planners likely to apply from the project?
  - Many planners were excited about overlaying different priorities (salmon areas, critical areas, etc), although this would take more work.

- The biological significance layers are most interesting/useful; planners will apply their own “risk” layers (e.g., zoning information).
  - The Conservation Opportunity Framework is not especially useful for an individual project because planners have very defined sources they need to consult. The framework more useful for longer-term decisions. If the timing is right, could influence comprehensive plans.
- IRIS has given the Council a huge start in carrying forward the Council's work. This is a good model for how the Council can help regions with implementation.
  - The data in the COF is not useful at the parcel level; Some Council members felt that the maps are not ready for prime time. The Council has a lot of work to do to make these maps useful, even for long-term planning (for example making the underlying data layers accessible). If we leave them as is, we could be doing a disservice to our communities.
  - John Thoren commented that he learned that the model doesn't have to be perfect to have value. The COF biodiversity significance layer works for large properties and it can be refined over time. Local groups must be empowered to modify the maps—to update the data and fix errors—to keep the maps credible.
  - The data must be transparent to be trusted. The Council's work is not finished—need to package and market it. Otherwise we are setting up a situation for unintended consequences. (Kate)
  - The COF is being used, for better or worse (Puget Sound Partnership currently and other efforts).

Nancy Warner noted that the group of planners IRIS has been working with is really invested. The Council could invite them to contribute and it might be an opportunity they would welcome.

Josh Weiss thanked Nancy for her presentation and all of her work. The Council will discuss the Conservation Opportunity Framework maps further at the December meeting.

BREAK

### **DECISION ON FUNDING WORKGROUP PROJECTS**

Josh Weiss suggested that the discussion begin with what he termed option A, to approve \$10,000 for each of the four workgroup projects.

#### Council Discussion:

- Council members proposed holding money back and not funding all four projects, even though they are all good. (Megan, Josh, Ikuno)
  - Council will need resources for the scorecard and the Conservation Opportunity Framework, especially for communication.
  - The scorecard and the Conservation Opportunity Framework are flagship projects for the Council (Josh, Leonard)
- Kate suggested that the Land Use proposal has a lot of merit and will help the Council understand end-users better and thus help frame communication.
- Council members expressed concern about the current scorecard contract with University of Washington, and whether the scope of work had been completed (Kate, Ikuno)
  - Rob clarified that the scope of work had been broad and optimistic for the timeframe. University made a good faith effort to complete as many parts of the scope as possible.
  - Peter noted that it's not unusual for a scientific scope of work to be overly ambitious. The decision is whether to pull the plug or continue to develop.
- Strategically important to show progress before the Council's sunset date in June 2010, and if necessary, provide enough guidance so products can continue if Council does not. (Leonard)
- Land use workgroup proposal would provide communication tools about the COF. The scorecard is not far enough along yet to develop communication tools. Need to get additional help on that. (Leonard)

Lynn clarified that each of the projects is a partnership with Council staff. Staff time is a resource for each project.



Paul summed up the communication options for the Scorecard project currently on the table: Council staff, a new committee, the outreach workgroup, or the science committee working with other Council members.

Mitch Friedman made a **MOTION** to approve \$5,000 to each committee except for science, and to give the science committee more time to decide what funding they need. Ron Shultz **SECONDED**. The Council **DISCUSSED** the motion as presented.

Council members expressed disagreement with the motion.

- Concern about spreading money too thin (Megan, Josh)
- Suggest focus on the scorecard and the maps (Megan, Mike, Clay)
- Would prefer to give the Science/scorecard project the full \$16,000 (Megan, Mike, Clay) or at least \$10,000 (Leonard, Rob)
- Suggest funding the land use project at \$10,000 and hold back funds for strategic communications (Clay)
- Would prefer to defer incentives and outreach projects (Megan, Mike, Josh)
- Suggest holding back funds in case of budget cuts.

Council members expressed agreement with the motion.

- Authorizing the workgroups to spend \$5,000 would help the projects move forward. Some groups might not use the full amount if they use staff time as much as possible. (Leonard)
- Important to keep some money back for cuts or for additional work later on (Leonard)
- Suggest Science Committee funding to remain separate. By December we would have a better idea of what funding is needed (Ron Shultz).

Josh Weiss **CALLED** the motion. A show of hands indicated **THREE IN FAVOR** and the **MAJORITY OPPOSED**. The motion **FAILED**.

Lynn Helbrecht summarized Council discussion: Award \$10,000 each for scorecard and land use. Convene separate workgroup for strategic approach to scorecard aggregation and communication. Do not move forward on incentives or outreach projects. Ron Shultz so **MOVED** Ron Juris **SECONDED**. The Council **DISCUSSED** the motion as presented.

Council members made several suggestions

- Give the Science workgroup \$6,000 to finish its obligations for the scorecard and use \$4,000 to get help with communication separately. (Ikuno)
- \$10,000 would buy better science on the scorecard. The workgroup could work on defining a way forward on communications. (Ron S)
- Communications will take more than \$4,000 (Mitch)
- This small amount of money is not effective leverage with the University of Washington

Peter Heide **AMENDED** the motion. Add \$6,000 to the score card with the caveat that UW finish the technical work as described yesterday and that they follow through with peer review before they complete the work.

Ron Shultz **DID NOT ACCEPT** the amendment. Clay Sprague **SECONDED THE AMENDMENT** to keep it on the table.

Council members expressed disagreement with the amendment.

- Frustration with needing to grant the scorecard additional funds for a scientifically defensible product.
  - Willing to give the scorecard \$10,000 but not \$16,000 (Josh, Megan, Ikuno, Kate)
  - Wants clear identification of deliverables (Ikuno, Kate)

Council members expressed agreement with the amendment.

- Would vote for additional \$6,000 to ensure the appropriate documentation (Mike).
  - Clarification that the project will be appropriately documented and peer reviewed at either funding level (Steven, Rob)
  - If Steven has an assistant (i.e., if \$16,000 is funded) work will be more complete. If not, he will need to prioritize based on Council guidance. (Steven, Rob)
- Would vote for it because it is foundational to what scorecard needs (Clay)

Josh Weiss **CALLED** for a vote on the amendment to add \$6,000 to the score card. A show of hands indicated **FIVE IN FAVOR** and the **MAJORITY OPPOSED**. The amendment **FAILED**.

Discussion returned to the motion on the table, to award \$10,000 each for scorecard and land use. Convene separate workgroup for strategic approach to scorecard aggregation and communication. Do not move forward on incentives or outreach projects.

Leonard Bauer made a friendly amendment that the Science Committee 1) assure full documentation and peer review of the scorecard framework 2) work with the newly-established workgroup on aggregation and 3) prioritize completion of a) mesic forest, b) marine.

Ron Shultz noted that he was leaning toward accepting the friendly amendment, but is holding off because wants the Council to be able to discuss.

Council members expressed disagreement with the amendment.

- We are micro-managing (Mitch).
- The workgroup on aggregation must work with the Science Committee, not be a separate entity working with Steven. (Rob).

Ron Shultz **ACCEPTED** the friendly amendment. The Council **DISCUSSED** the amended motion.

- Suggestion that more voices needed on science committee and clarification of new workgroup. (Josh)
- Suggestion to compare with other status and trends publications. Many practical ways to look at how to communicate. (Ron S)
- Lynn Helbrecht suggested that the science committee still guide the scorecard but that the new workgroup will look at where the scorecard goes from December on, working with the science committee.

### ***Approval of Projects***

Josh Weiss called for a **VOTE** on the amended motion as presented. With a unanimous show of hands, the Council **APPROVED** the amended motion, to award \$10,000 each to the scorecard and land use committee projects. Convene separate workgroup for strategic approach to scorecard aggregation and communication. Do not move forward on incentives or outreach projects. The Science Committee will 1) assure full documentation and peer review of the scorecard framework 2) work with the newly-established workgroup on aggregation and 3) prioritize completion of a) mesic forest, b) marine.

Council members volunteered to form the new strategic communications workgroup: Leonard Bauer, Ron Shultz, Clay Sprague, Mike Mosman, Mitch Friedman, Ikuno Masterson, Megan White, and Kate Stenberg. Lynn Helbrecht will convene the workgroup.

### **HABITAT CONNECTIVITY INITIATIVE**

Josh Weiss referred to Resolution 2009-02, which indicated the Council would further clarify its role in this initiative at the October meeting. However, we have not been able to work with the Governor's Office on this issue in the interim, and he suggests that we table discussion of the Council's role until December.

Lynn Helbrecht provided a briefing on progress to date. She has been serving as a bridge between the Biodiversity Council, the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Workgroup, and the Western Governors' Connectivity group. Since June, the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Workgroup has

been working on a communication piece, and on one-on-one stakeholder interviews to elicit opinions and concerns about wildlife corridors.

Bill Robinson, of Robinson Research, contracted with the Workgroup to conduct the interviews and focus groups. He gave a PowerPoint presentation of his findings.

They spoke with individuals, groups, heads of trade associations, state agency staff, staff of associations of counties and cities, county planners, forest land owners, ranchers. He cautioned that the samplings were small, not necessarily representative, not quantitative, and not projectable.

He presented a summary of some of the comments heard, which included the following:

- Awareness of wildlife corridors was low and the subject was rarely discussed
- “Wildlife Corridors” is by far the most accepted term.
- “Open Space” is popular with landowners, but more than likely so because it connotes some special funding
- The word “corridors” is problematic
- Landowners are very suspicious of schemes to “lock up the land”
- Forest and agricultural landowners feel overburdened by agencies and regulations
- Private landowners feel they are being forced to carry the ecological burden for all of us
- Private landowners are familiar with the concept of ecological services having monetary value
- An 80-year-old home in the center of a city blocks wildlife as much as one in a new development

#### Council Discussion:

There was some discussion of possible names other than “corridor.” Kate thought “network” might be useful. Bill Robinson said when things get too “sciency,” people lose interest. John Thoren said establishing trust is really key.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

#### **NEXT STEPS AND CLOSING COMMENTS:**

Josh and Lynn summarized the next steps.

- The next Council meeting is December 2, 2009, at the Nisqually Wildlife Refuge
- Lynn will contact Council members with the final version of the Council letter regarding the Natural Resource Agency reform.
- Staff will work on the University of Washington contract.
- Staff will convene the new strategic communications workgroup.
- Staff will convene the Land Use group to move its project forward.
- The North Central Washington Success Summit is November 18.

Items to add to the December agenda:

- Conservation Opportunity Framework maps—are we ready for prime time?
- Scorecard; report from workgroup on communication strategy.
- Revisit workgroup proposals for incentives and outreach
- Habitat connectivity
- Update on Council duration; work plan, extension.
- Invite county planners to a committee meeting or the December meeting.

Nancy Warner announced that the North Central Washington Healthy Lands Roundtable will be in January.

#### **CLOSING**

Josh closed by commending the group on a really good meeting. The highlight for him was the talk by Rufus Woods on how to create hope by taking positive steps to achieve good things. That is consistent with how this Council has always tried to work—keeping it positive.

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

---

Josh Weiss, Chair